

DETAILED ACTION

This is a first office action in response to application no. 10/596,452 filed on August 20, 2008 in which claims 1-26 are presented for examination.

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. Paragraphs [0031] and [0048] of the US Patent Application Publication contain embedded hyperlinks. Correction is required.

Abstract

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;

- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

The Abstract is objected to because it contains the numerical details of the drawings (i.e., Fig. 1). In other words, the numbers between parentheses referring to specific elements of a figure must be deleted.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1-26 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims contain many reference characters (numbers between parentheses), and the Examiner suggests that the applicant delete the characters so as to avoid confusion. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Regarding claims 1-26, the word "means" is preceded by the word(s) "monitoring" in an attempt to use a "means" clause to recite a claim element as a means for performing a specified function. However, since no function is specified by the word(s) preceding "means," it is impossible to determine the equivalents of the element, as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. See *Ex parte Klumb*, 159 USPQ 694 (Bd. App. 1967).

The applicant is urged to review the claim as well as the Specification in order to identify the support for the word "means" preceding monitoring.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-11, 14-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Akashi et al. (US Patent no. 6,611,297).

Regarding claims 1 and 26, Akashi discloses a method and supplementary visual display system for use in conjunction with a display device including an image display region for presenting images to a viewer (See col. 1, lines 35-49), comprising one or more illumination sources disposed in a configuration at least one of at least partially peripherally surrounding the image display region (See col. 2, lines 5-19 and col. 3, lines 20-24), and arranged to project illumination radiated therefrom so as to illuminate a region visually appearing to the viewer to at least partially peripherally surrounding the image display region (See col. 34, lines 3-23), monitoring means for monitoring at least one of, audio program content (See col. 41, lines 59-67, col. 42, lines 1-4 and lines 55-62), and intensity and/or color and/or depth information in the entire image display region or in one or more sub-regions of the image display region when images are presented thereon, and generating corresponding image and/or audio indicative signals (See col. 3, lines 55-67, col. 4, lines 1-9), and controlling means for controlling light

radiation emitted in use from the one or more illumination sources in response to the image and/or audio indicative signals so as to provide at least a partial spatial extension of the image display region (See col. 3, lines 40-67 and col. 4, lines 1-3).

As per claims 2-3, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejection of claim 1. In addition, Akashi further discloses a monitoring means and control means arranged such that the one or more illumination sources in conjunction with the monitoring means and controlling means are operable to respond to at least one of color intensity and depth information presented in sub-regions of the image display region substantially spatially adjacent to where the one or more illumination sources are either mounted in respect of the image display region or arranged to project light radiation emitted therefrom as perceived by the viewer (See col. 3, lines 40-66).

As per claims 6-7, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejection of claim 1. In addition, Akashi further discloses user deactivated illumination sources, and wherein the illumination sources are disposed in one or more illumination panels disposed at least one of laterally, above and below the image display region is disposed substantially upright orientation in operation (See col. 22, lines 33-50 and lines 60-67 and col. 23, lines 1-2).

As per claims 9-11, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejection of claim 1. In addition, Akashi further provides a wide-screen display device

disposed laterally in respect of the image display region and/or arranged to project their illumination substantially laterally as perceived by the viewer (See col. 25, lines 51-67, col. 26, lines 1-8 and col. 33, lines 18-33).

As per claims 14-15, Akashi further discloses displaying two-dimensional images in fig. 6A.

As per claims 16-22, Akashi further discloses displaying three-dimensional image after determining depth information, wherein the light from illumination sources is correlated (See col. 37, lines 8-23).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akashi et al. (US Patent no. 6,611,297) in view of Seymour US Patent Application Publication no. 2004/0239582 A1.

Regarding claims 23-25, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejections of claims 1 and 22.

It is noted that Akashi is silent about providing the illumination sources as matrix-like array and wherein the illumination sources area are provided on a carrier substrate as specified in the claims.

However, Seymour provides a visual display system wherein the illumination sources as matrix-like array and wherein the illumination sources area are provided on a carrier substrate (See Seymour paragraphs [0032], [0035], and [003]).

Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would recognize the advantage of modifying Akashi's visual display system by incorporating Seymour's teachings wherein a visual display system with illumination sources as matrix-like array and wherein the illumination sources area are provided on a carrier substrate. The motivation for performing such a modification in Akashi is to create a grey scale in order to correspond to today's display where most of them offer 256 level of brightness per pixel as taught by Seymour (See paragraph [0035]).

9. Claims 4-5, 8, 12-13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hytry et al. (US Patent no. 5807110) teaches method and device for selecting color coordinates designs.

Nason et al. (US Patent no. 6717596) teaches method and system for controlling user interface on a display surface.

Abileah (US Patent no. 6111622) teaches day/night backlight for a liquid crystal display.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GIMS PHILIPPE whose telephone number is (571)272-7336. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10:30-7:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/596,452
Art Unit: 2485

Page 9

Gims S Philippe
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2485

/G. P./
/Gims S Philippe/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2485